

Library of
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY



BRIGHTON, MASSACHUSETTS

The Review

Founded, Edited, and Published by Arthur Preuss.

Published Weekly at \$2. a Year (Foreign \$2.50.)

Office: 13 N. 3rd Street. Telephone, Bridge 246A.

[Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as Second Class Matter in August 1896.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page		Page		Page
Evolution—Qualified and Unqualified. (William Gough.)	305	(J. F. M.)—Notes.	312	Notes,
Subjects of the Day :		With Our Exchanges. (Arthur Preuss)	313	Art Notes :
Perjury. — The Summer School as a		Insurance :		The American Ecclesiological Society. (John T. Comes.)
Matrimonial Agency. — Polyglot		Life Insurance Examination.—The	314	
Bishops for Polyglot Dioceses. (A.	310	Royal Arcanum. (d'Azincourt)	314	Current Educational Topics :
P.)		Editorial Letterbox.	315	The O'Brien Plan.
The Religious World :		Book Reviews and Literary Notes :		Catholic Federation :
Domestic.—Catholic Poles in the U.	312	Literary Notes.—Booklist.	315	A New Conference. — The German
S.—Notes.		Science and Industry :		Plan.
Foreign: — A Broadminded Prelate.		Historic Character of the Deluge.—		Notes and Remarks.
				Curious Facts and Fancies.
				318
				320

EVOLUTION---QUALIFIED AND UNQUALIFIED.



WHILE there is no particular necessity for entering into a dissertation on Evolution at the present time—a necessity occasioned by the birth of a new theory or the rehabilitation of an old one by some recent luminary in the scientific firmament—still, the fact that the fanciful creations which have long ago emanated from the imaginations of Darwin, Huxley, and Tyndall are not only far from being swept away, but, on the contrary, are flowing quietly along in a strong undercurrent and constitute the firm creed of many members of the so-called modern scientific school of thought, would seem to justify us in making a few observations on this much-mooted question.

There used to be a popular impression to the effect that Evolution is the invention of Darwin and signifies the descent of man as man from the monkey. Although this conception had the merit of being somewhat

simple, to say the least, it has graciously given way to others broader in their scope and, to those at least who are wedded to the theory, far more satisfactory. As it is not our purpose to trace out the history of the origin and development of Evolution, suffice it to say that the idea of development is far from being a modern one. It can be traced back to the earlier Greek philosophers and has a place in the systems of all periods. We might, indeed, if we were so inclined, point out, step by step, how our present scholastic schools were evolved from the Aristotelian, the Aristotelian from the Platonic, the Platonic from the Ionic, and the latter from the semi-religious schools of Egypt. We shall, however, merely endeavor to recall a few patent facts which may have been lost sight of in the deluge of theories with which hostile extremists have seen fit to inundate the qualified and more conservative Evolution advocated in spiritual philosophy.

Omitting a discussion of the innumerable definitions of Evolution which have been advanced, we may consider it simply as an organised universal law of causation by which one thing is developed or drawn out of another. Dr. McCosh views the terms Evolution and Development as having much the same meaning, both pointing to one operation as seen under somewhat different aspects. Development is the process going on, whereas Evolution refers to the process as we look back upon it. There is certainly nothing very abstract about this restricted view of the nature of Evolution; it is frank and definite, for the man is certainly evolved from the youth and the youth from the child. But what are we to understand by the Evolution defended by Darwin, Huxley, and Tyndall? Shall we look upon it in the light of an Evolution which begins by assuming the existence of life, of one life-form out of another, inevitably and because it was its nature? Is it an Evolution that has been in existence throughout that involved contradiction an infinite space of time, at least when compared with the testimony of the rocks—an Evolution, however, presided over by the designer who contrived it? Or, shall we consider it with no predetermination in the original forms towards one development rather than another, "an Evolution of life from the lifeless, of mind from the mindless, of man from the monkey, of the monkey from the mollusc, of the mollusc from the monad—an Evolution of all from the senseless molecule, eternal and self-existent, capable of dispensing with a Supreme Being?" This latter phase of the development theory, which, when contrasted with Mosaic creation is sometimes called the creation of Evolution, is simply unscientific.

From the array of scientific writers who are of one mind with us on this subject, it will suffice to quote the words of Dr. St. George Mivart, who, on this point at least, is not a partisan writer. He says: "That there is an absolute break between the living world and the world devoid of life, is what scientific men are now agreed about, thanks to the persevering labors of M. Pasteur. Those who affirm

that though life does not arise from inorganic matter now, nevertheless it did so a long time ago, affirm what is at the least contrary to all the evidence we possess, and they bring forward nothing more in favor of it than the undoubted fact that it is a supposition which is necessary for the validity of their own speculative views."

In general, the precise meaning of Evolution, as far as some writers are concerned, is a matter of great doubt. With them the term is equivocal. Now, it would imply that one life-form produces another inevitably, because it is its nature to do so, just as the seed produces the plant. Again, it seems to give the impression that there is no predetermined force in the original germs of life towards one development working definitely towards one place in preference to another, and that extrinsic causes have produced those forced determinate forms which we now observe.

While we can not claim to have solved the identity of the forces or factors which enter into the discussion of development, Prof. Le Conte tells us that there are four factors at least which merit recognition. However, they appeal to us more on account of their popularity than owing to their intrinsic truth. The first two emanate from Lamarck, viz.: the influence of environment which, as it changes, affects functions. The function, in turn, affects the structure, and the changes thus produced are inherited and integrated throughout successive generations; and the second, the increased use or disuse of organs producing changes in form, structure, and size of organs, which changes are also inherited and integrated as before. The other two factors are Darwinian. They are known as Natural Selection, or the Survival of the Fittest occurring among individuals of those most in accord with their environment in each generation; and Sexual Selection. The last is of minor importance.

Darwin in his 'Origin of Species,' says that "Natural Selection acts exclusively by the preservation and accumulation of variations, which are beneficial under the organic and inorganic conditions to which each crea-

ture is exposed at all periods of life. The ultimate result is that each creature tends to become more and more improved in relation to its condition. This improvement inevitably leads to the gradual advancement of the organisation of the greater number of human beings throughout the world. This constant strain on each creature to improve its condition, which is absolutely essential to the theory of unqualified Evolution, is in direct opposition to the co-existence of the high and low organisms which we find at the present day." This obstacle is not removed by our friend Lamarck, who maintains that new and simple forms are continually being produced by spontaneous generation—an exploded theory, for the facts against it are pretty obstinate and hard to stifle. Darwin fails to see any difficulty at all. To quote his own words: "Natural Selection, or the Survival of the Fittest, does not necessarily include progressive improvement; it only takes advantage of such variations as arise and are beneficial to each creature under the complex relations of life." Now, if these variations are beneficial to any one creature, they must of a necessity be beneficial to every creature of the same conditions of life. Hence, "if Natural Selection takes advantage of those variations for any one creature, it must take advantage of them for all creatures of the same conditions of life; and, if Natural Selection is in reality the "Survival of the Fittest," then only those creatures should survive which could be able to develop into man of the present time; and organisms as low as we now find them should not now be in existence. Thus it would seem that our original difficulty remains in full force; for we have against Natural Selection a formidable array of facts.

The four factors assigned by Lamarck and Darwin, which seem to be the most widely known, can hardly account for the phenomena of Evolution, especially when we take under consideration the genesis of man. Like many other factors invented to fit a theory they are necessarily more suggestive than demonstrative. Evolution, as we consider it, does not derive its proofs from any one branch of

science. It is an induction from many sciences, and we find Astronomy, Chemistry, Botany, Biology, Sociology, and Geology testifying to its existence. We admit an Evolution such as accounts for the process by which the oak comes from the acorn, the butterfly from the caterpillar, or both from an egg—the resultant of some intrinsic force working towards a definite plan under the guidance of an all-wise Designer to Whom it bears witness.

A careful analysis of all the facts disclosed by the sciences above mentioned forces us to admit that this is the only kind of Evolution of which we have practical experience. Our position as defenders of spiritual philosophy does not cause us to be diametrically opposed to Evolution when this hypothesis is properly limited and defined. But the statement made by some Evolutionists to the effect that we know that all living beings must have arisen by continuous physical processes out of inorganic matter, is a gratuitous assumption, or, as St. Thomas would say, self-contradictory and absurd.

This is very evident from the admission of Huxley and Tyndall that proof of a single case of spontaneous generation has not yet been discovered.

The facility of Evolution to solve every mystery connected with the universe is unhesitatingly claimed by our enthusiastic adversaries. While it has been most valuable in explaining the development of the universe, we must realize the fact that it has nothing whatever to do with the origin of life. We must lay it down at the very outset that Evolution has its limitations. Viewing the matter philosophically there is nothing in Evolution which is out of harmony with reason if, as the learned Jesuit Father Bödder remarks, "we only adhere to the following principles: First, the only Evolution is that of matter created by God through principles of force set to work by Him originally and working throughout all ages according to laws determined by His infinite wisdom; second, a lower principle of force is never by itself alone the total cause of the production of a higher one, and, consequently, the more perfect offspring of an imperfect

series of living beings is not due to the generative power alone of that series, but other causes must conspire to produce it; third, a human person is never the effect of Evolution, for, while the generative power of a creative agent can predispose matter for the reception of a human soul, nevertheless, inasmuch as the soul is spiritual, God alone can create and join it to matter from which union a man is the result."

Those who deny the existence of God as the Creator assert that things exist necessarily. But whence comes this necessity for the existence of things? Common sense would seem to tell us that the necessity for the existence of things, even if we grant the assumption for the sake of argument, means that things are required to exist. If this is the case, then there is a cause for the existence of things and hence our adversaries' reasoning leads them unavoidably to a cause for things. And if things necessarily have a cause, this cause must create things; and unless our friends, for the sake of inventing a new terminology, see fit to honor this cause with some other title, we must acknowledge this cause as the Creator, the Lord and Master of the universe, without Whose creative act their so-called "Moneron" could never have existed.

Just to what extent observation has justified or will justify the theory of Evolution qualified and restricted, must be left to the decision of biologists. Right reason working along experimental lines would seem to imply that such a development is an organized causation working in an environment, and that everywhere we discover order and design. The one great difficulty is to explain development in organic matter. Who is to settle the question of the origin of species? In the introduction to the 'Descent of Man,' Darwin remarks: "The object of this book is to consider whether man, like every other species, is descended from some preëxisting form." According to this statement it would seem that Mr. Darwin, with refreshing frankness, takes for granted, without a shred of proof, that every species except man has des-

cended from some preëxisting form. And this in the face of the well-known fact that not a single species has been proven to descend from a preëxisting form specifically distinct from itself. Why, were one species to be proven as descending from a preëxisting form, then another species can in like manner be shown to do so, and another and another, and so on. Finally, man at least in regard to his bodily structure can, in a like manner, be shown to do so, and the theory of Evolution would be accepted universally by all thinkers, like the axioms of geometry. That Darwin is in error in the very first steps of his investigation is very evident. In his process of reasoning, in addition to a fact that has existence only in his imagination, he assumes a false premiss, and consequently his conclusion is an inference from a dishonest argument concealed by a glittering style.

"In considering the origin of species, it is quite conceivable," Dr. McCosh says, "that God Who created all things should have created, by a direct act without a medium or without a process, the first member of the innumerable plants and animals on the earth, and then allowed or rather enabled them to go down by an evolutionary heredity in virtue of a superadded force working from within."

"But we can also conceive as equally possible," as Dr. McCosh says in effect, "that God may have organised the different species out of the preëxisting materials, even as He made man's body out of the dust of the ground, and that out of the constituents of the universe He may have arranged that these should combine and form those aggregates which we call plants and animals, and, as the ages went on, to form new species in exceptional cases, bearing in mind that these elements will not of themselves form living beings without some superadded heredity or power—all of which is an Evolution supposing an omniscient, omnipotent God as its motive power."

Darwin's trust in the potency of his theory arises from the fact that, although he is aware that the serial arrangements in which all organisms are classified, are far from being complete and that there are gaps between species

which human ingenuity and research have not as yet connected—and this is absolutely necessary before we may consider his theory to be anything more than a mere product of the human fancy—still, from an inspection of some known facts, he nurses the hope that time and the untiring industry of philosophers will bring to light the missing links so much needed for the chain of successive development of species from preëxisting forms. And, even had he all the missing species, he would only be able to show a vast serial scheme of organism, which would not be a proof of gradual Evolution. So that the great number of facts known to him and the equally great number of facts unknown to him do not establish the theory of Evolution.

Unfortunately, we have no time to make a critical examination of all the theories of Evolution. The main difference lies in the fact that some attach more importance to the operation of the internal elements, and others to the external circumstances, as, for instance, environment.

We have said before that Evolution has its limitations. It can not explain everything, and, for instance, fails to give an account of the organisation of things. This is implied in its very nature, for it is simply the derivation of one thing from another. It does not originate the power which works in development and it can not of itself give us the verified laws and final ends we see in nature.

One of the great arguments advanced in support of unqualified Evolution is that of "embryonic development," which is laid down by Herbert Spencer in his *First Principles*. According to this theory every human body in the first beginnings of its existence is a small mass of jelly and then in its growth it takes the likeness of a fish and of successive classes of brutes, until at length it takes the characteristics of a man. With supremest effrontery and without a jot or tittle of proof the assumption is made that the history of the race has been the same as that seen in the individual—as if identity of structure argued identity of origin—and then is proclaimed with much noise that man is descended from

a fish! Why, at most, this would only tend to prove the imperfection of the means of investigation that an embryologist has at his command! "It has been maintained," Professor Agassiz says, "that superior animals pass, during their development, through all the phases which characterize inferior classes. Thus formulated, the proposition is contrary to truth." No one supposes for a single moment, as the learned Jesuit Father Gerard says, "that the jellylike mass which had its origin in a human being can ever live with any life but that of a man." Should we be unable, at a certain stage of its growth, to distinguish its structure from that of a fish, then the only legitimate conclusion is, that we are unable to gain a perfect knowledge of the object before us. Something escapes our notice and that something is that which distinguishes the jellylike mass of a man from the jellylike mass of a fish. You may call this with Huxley and Tyndall an "indefinable something," or, with Herbert Spencer, the "Persistence of Force"; but to argue "I see no difference; therefore, there is no difference," is to adopt an altogether unsafe mode of reasoning.

From this brief paper it is clear, First, that the only Evolution which receives any attestation from the records of the past is that which affirms that the seed develops into the shrub, the shrub into the flower, and the flower into the fruit; Second, that no phase of the evolutionary theory can ever account for the origin of things or afford a reasonable solution of the genesis of matter, force, and life; Third, that the unqualified Evolution, for which Haeckel claims the property of discovering the origin of species in the protoplasm, is a sin against right reason and, Finally, that singularly restricted phase of Evolution, which, admitting a break or distinction between animal and plant life, affirms that it can trace the various species of each genus of beings to a few primordial forms, is not absolutely inconceivable, but, as a fact, is at least contrary to all the evidence we possess at the present time.

In conclusion we can and must say that the study of the works of Creation has not yielded any sufficient reason to lead us to discard, to

say the least, the accepted accounts of the origin of the body of man as well as the creatures that are to minister to his wants. If our adversaries fail to comprehend everything, then the fault must be imputed not to Creation but to their limited intellects. All things are so bound to each other by a filament that permeates them all, that no true explanation can be given for even the simplest or most insignificant thing without a knowledge of all things. This accounts for the wide diversity of opinion regarding Evolution and gives us the reason why the thousand and one theories invented by so-called philosophers for the purpose of explaining natural phenomena are being constantly exploded. These thinkers no sooner collect a few facts than they identify them with some hobby or other. Then, other facts being discovered, the theory based on those previously known must be modified to accommodate itself to the latest discoveries; and when these new facts become too numerous they are found to be incompatible with the original theory and a new theory is invented, which in like manner becomes modified after a while and is finally refuted entirely, like the first. Thus the reason

and intellect of man are continually subject to modifications and changes in consequence of his ignorance.

If we are looking for the true *raison d'être* of the many false theories adduced in favor of unqualified Evolution, it may be found in the modern tendency to explain away a Supreme Being. Were the Darwinian hypothesis to hold good—on condition, of course, that we deny the basic principle of all science, the rationality of the universe—there would certainly be no necessity for a Creator possessing unlimited power to whom we have to give an account of our actions. But it is very evident that a rational view of qualified development can in no wise conflict with the theory of the existence of God. On the contrary, it furnishes us with confirmation and elucidation of that belief which is fundamental to the theory of Christianity. The doctrine of true development destroys the conception of the world as a machine. It makes God the vital force, ever present, directing the progress of the world. It reveals His power and immensity, and while it would make us tremble thereby, it also reveals to us how He alone is our constant refuge and support.—*The Xavier*.

WILLIAM GOUGH.

Subjects of the Day.

Perjury.

With President McCarthy of the Iowa Bar Association, Judge Oliver H. Horton of Chicago believes that perjury and the subornation of perjury are the two most prevalent crimes of to-day. This is a disquieting and discouraging statement, as the condition alleged would paralyze the administration of justice, and put in jeopardy the property, reputation, and lives of even innocent persons; yet it is made by men presumably in a position to know whereof they speak—the one with an experience of fifteen years on the bench, the other raised by his fellows to the head of their State association. Both legally trained, presumably speak on evidence satisfactory to them, and if the evidence justifies such a sweeping charge, the question arises, Why

should it not justify prosecutions? That is about the only available legal remedy, and it is a special province of the bench and the bar to apply it. Judge Horton recognizes this, and also suggests pertinently greater formality and dignity in the administration of the oath. To stand a number of witnesses in a row, ask them to raise their right hands, and then mumble the form of the oath to them, concluding "So help you God, sit down," is not impressive either to witnesses or spectators. Much better would it be to require each witness to repeat the oath, explaining to him at the same time the pains and penalties of its violation. This might deter from the crime of perjury all except the most hardened, and for those the only remedy is the prison-cell. Yet, what rarer in court practice than a prosecution for perjury?

The Summer School as a Matrimonial Agency.

The *Catholic Universe* (Aug. 2nd) winds up its

report of the late session of the Columbian Catholic Summer School with an examination of the question: Was it a success? "Taking the school as a whole," it says, "lectures and attendance being considered, the answer would be that the school was not a success. There were more out-of-town attendants than ever before, but Detroiters responded very poorly and attended but few of the lectures."

The *New Century* (quoted by the *Universe* in the same issue) takes perhaps the correct view of the real elements of summer-school success:

The wise director of summer schools will reckon his success, not by the number of attendants at the eloquent, the edifying, the stimulating and satisfactory lectures, but by the number of engagements made on the grounds. We all understand that the real object of summer schools ought to be to promote the proper kind of marriages. If the lecturers do not interfere with this, let them be retained. But no summer school can afford to retain lecturers who are so interesting as to prevent conversation. Where the summer schools have hitherto failed has been in forgetting their veritable mission.

Until the statistics as to engagements and marriages are sifted and classified, we are not prepared to say whether the summer schools are a failure or a success. What the Catholic press want are satisfactory and scientific statistics on this subject, not long and rhetorical letters which occupy valuable advertising space. When these statistics are supplied, then and only then, can we pro-

nounce as to the success or failure of the summer schools.



Polyglot Bishops for Polyglot Dioceses.

The *Freeman's Journal* (Aug. 3rd) gives two and a half columns of space to an appeal, by Rev. W. Kruszka, of Ripon, Wis., for "polyglot bishops for polyglot dioceses." His thesis is that "for a bishop in a polyglot diocese the gift of divers languages is—'ceteris paribus'—a quite necessary and indispensable attribute." Incidentally he pleads for representation of the Poles in the American hierarchy.

"We Poles in America," he concludes, "do not ask any special privilege, we only ask just and equal treatment in the ecclesiastical hierarchy."

Father Kruszka's position is practically identical with that of THE REVIEW, which has for seven years incessantly battled for equal rights for the Catholics of *all* nationalities and tongues in this big melting caldron of races. We are glad he has succeeded in getting his article printed in the *Freeman's Journal*, which, though it has never taken a square stand on this question, belongs, we believe, to the "Americanizing" section of the Catholic press.

Let us all be Catholics, holding not like the *Independent* (No. 2749), that "Those who speak our tongue are our brothers; those who speak another tongue, are strangers, barbarians, enemies"; but that we are all children of the same Father and should love one another like brethren, regardless of tongue or race or color or caste.—A. P.



The Religious World.

...Domestic...

Catholic Poles in the U. S. In his letter to the *Freeman's Journal* (Aug. 3rd), referred to under "Subjects of the Day," Rev. W. Kruszkas gives the number of Catholic Poles in the U. S. as one and a half million, and claims they are provided with only four hundred priests, a decidedly insufficient number. He quotes the author of 'Historya Polska w Ameryce' ("The Polish History of America," 1900), as authority for the subjoined figures:

There are 69,300 Polish Catholics in the Buffalo Diocese, or nearly one-half of the entire Catholic population of that Diocese; there are 57,200 in the Diocese of Pittsburgh, or one-fifth; 48,500 in the Diocese of Scranton, or one-third; 48,200 in the Diocese of Cleveland, or nearly one-fifth; 32,200 in the Diocese of Fort Wayne, or one-third; 14,750 in the Diocese of Marquette, or one-fifth; 44,100 in the Diocese of Grand Rapids, or over one-third; 47,900 in the Diocese of Detroit, or one-fourth; 172,600 in the Archdiocese of Chicago, or one-fifth; 16,600 in the Diocese of Omaha, or one-fourth; 16,400 in the Diocese of Duluth, or over one-half; 23,800 in the Diocese of St. Cloud, or over one-half; 31,210 in the Diocese of Green Bay, or one-fourth; 46,080 in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee, or one-fifth; besides, in the Dioceses of La Crosse, St. Paul, Winona, Fargo, Sioux Falls, Lincoln, Peoria, Belleville, St. Louis, St. Joseph, Kansas City, San Antonio, Galveston, Oregon, Nesqually, Columbus, Cincinnati, Philadelphia, Harrisburg (one-third), Erie, New York, Brooklyn, Albany, Syracuse, Rochester, Newark, Trenton, Hartford, Providence, Boston, Springfield—in each of these dioceses the Polish Catholics constitute a considerable part, about or less than one-fifth, not taking into account the Lithuanians, Bohemians, Slovaks, and other Slovanian nations.

Father Kruszkas quotes Bishop Spalding, of Peoria, as saying, as long ago as Aug. 14th, 1892, in an address delivered at La Salle, Ill.:

I am not a prophet, but this I can foretell you, that the Poles will play a conspicuous part in the Catholic Church in America. The immigration of other nations is decreasing, but that of Poles, Lithuanians, Bohemians, and Slovaks is increasing every day. And as the Poles constitute a majority, they will play a conspicuous part in the Catholic Church here—and I tell you, that here in America there will begin another Polish history.

....According to the *Pittsburg Observer* (Aug. 8th), the papal briefs erecting the Diocese of Altoona, Pa., and appointing Monsignor Garvey, of Pittston, as first bishop of the new see, have been received.

...Foreign...

A Broadminded Prelate.

A French Protestant paper, *Le Signal*, gives these details about the consecration of Msgr. Lacroix, the new Bishop of Tarentaise:

"The ceremony was very long and made up of a multitude of symbolic details, in which, no doubt, the consecrator and his assistants would have been entangled had it not been for the presence of a master of ceremonies from St. Sulpice, who appeared to be a liturgical pastmaster.

"I beheld the ceremony with curiosity and also with sympathy, for a friendship of eight years unites me with Msgr. Lacroix. Yet I felt no religious sentiment vibrating in me. For one moment I was deeply moved, when Msgr. Lacroix, accompanied by two assisting bishops, went through the church to bless the people. But soon after, when I saw the people kneeling and thronging to kiss the episcopal ring, I was transported very far and I heard the Apostle St. Peter say to Cornelius: 'Rise, I am but a man like thyself.'

"After the consecration, the invited guests preceded Msgr. Lacroix to the sacristy in procession headed by many clergymen and the provisor, and followed by professors from the Lycée Michelet, whose chaplain Msgr. Lacroix had been for ten years. Then came a preacher and his wife. Yes, a preacher. As

soon as Msgr. Lacroix got sight of him, he opened his arms, and after a truly brotherly salute, the preacher said to the Bishop: May the Head of the Church, who is Christ, bless your episcopal ministry! And the Bishop answered loudly, so that bishops and priests in his neighborhood could hear it: 'Thanks, my dear preacher.' Just a minute before, in his answers to the questions concerning faith, he had rejected and anathematized heresy; now he pressed a heretic to his bosom. Here we have the *caractéristique* of the new Bishop of Tarentaise."

"Just so," adds the Catholic *Vérité Française* (No. 2922), which is by no means as proud of this broadminded prelate as the Protestant *Signal*. Msgr. Lacroix is apparently of the mettle of that American Bishop who did not hesitate to bless publicly a statue of Brigham Young. We somehow have our doubts about the benefit of such "broadmindedness" to the cause of Catholicity.—J. F. M.

....The budget committee of the French Chambers has again voted to suppress the "budget des cultes," and the *Autorité* fears that the vote will be sustained. The religious orders are already practically dissolved and their belongings about to be confiscated. The next thing will be to starve out the secular clergy.

...."Americanism" has suffered a new and serious blow in the election of the new superior general of the Sulpitians, P. Lebas, who, contrary to his predecessor, P. Captier, is a thoroughly conservative theologian who has no love for "les novateurs." The chief representatives of the Sulpitians in this country, PP. Hogan and Magnien, belong to the liberal school, which strenuously but vainly opposed the election of P. Lebas.—C. M.

....After hesitating for a long time in regard to their attitude toward the new law of associations, it appears that the majority of the French congregations have decided not to apply for authorisation. The government, which did not anticipate this resistance, will be forced to expel them. The more expulsions, the better; such measures will be sure to turn the coming elections against the government.—C. M.

With Our Exchanges.

In the absence of its founder, publisher, and editor, who is taking a short and well-deserved vacation in Europe, *La Vérité*, of Québec, lately entered upon its twenty-first year of publication. It is a very excellent journal and we cordially wish it long life and prosperity.



Now we have the *Intermountain Catholic* (No. 42) repeating the stale, ridiculous, and oft-exploded story about a book of the present Pope, written while he was still Cardinal Pecci, being on the 'Index Librorum Prohibitorum.' The book is entitled 'Del Sangue Sacratissima di Maria. Studii per ottenere la festività del medesimo' (On the Most Holy Blood of Mary. Essay Showing Why We Should Have a Festival in Honor of the Same.)

A glance at the new revised edition of the Index (pp. 232 and 273) shows that the book in question, condemned by decree of the Holy Office on Jan. 13th, 1875, was written by one Carlo Paoletti.



Our attention is called to the following skit from the *Western Watchman* of July 18th, which we had overlooked:

Dogs have a nasty habit of eating their own vomit. Now, my dear Mr. Preuss, let that French dog who puked all over the American hierarchy lap up his own vomit. Don't help him.

The "dog" referred to is clearly the Rev. Dr. Charles Maignen, a fellow-priest of the reverend editor of the *Watchman*.

It jars our unsophisticated lay mind to see one priest thus calling another vile names.

Has Father Phelan never considered the truth of Marsh's dictum, that terms of abuse and vituperation serve rather to convey an impression of the speaker's (or writer's) moral status, than a distinct notion of the exact character and degree of depravity he wishes to impart to the subject of his denunciation?

ARTHUR PREUSS.

INSURANCE.

Life Insurance Examinations.

Experts in life insurance are gradually reaching the conclusion that medical examination in connection with the writing of policies has a much narrower value than the medical examiners are willing to admit.

Not long since the president of one of the most successful of the conservative life insurance companies of this country said in effect that the study of the vital statistics of his business, and of many years of records of acceptances and rejections, had convinced him that medical examination was very much less useful than its considerable cost to the companies would warrant them in expecting.

Asked why his company still maintained its system of medical examination, he said that it was probably the only way in which it was possible to approximate the average which would be reached without selection if men could be insured as they are enumerated for census purposes. A company which should "let down its bars" and take every one who came would not get a normal average. Sound men would postpone insurance until it could not be had on medical examination, and the company would quickly become the refuge of the sick and the impaired, to the exclusion of the desirable risks, who would go elsewhere, because unwilling to help carry the burdens of a business handicapped by the results of lax rules of admission.

From the statistics which every well-managed life insurance company has in its office, but does not show the public, great comfort may be derived by those classed as "impaired lives" and rejected on examination. Not only do they show that such people are likely to live as long, and, generally speaking, as comfortably as those who would be gladly accepted, but when the records are kept up they point to the conclusion that the impaired life, if not too seriously impaired, is likely to be prolonged far beyond the medical prognosis by reason of the care exercised by the man thus classed, who realizes, as the sound man rarely does or can, that he must take care of himself and avoid the excesses or exposures

which others think they may brave with impunity. From this point of view a rejection for insurance on medical examination may be a very useful *memento mori* to a man capable of profiting by the knowledge that he will find prudence and discretion conducive to longevity.



The Royal Arcanum.

The Royal Arcanum will soon be twenty-five years old. We have on a previous occasion expressed our opinion of its semi-secret and sectarian character. Regarding its safety as an insurance concern we learn from *Matson's Monthly* (quoted in the *Catholic Columbian*, Aug. 3rd) that it has failed to collect yearly a sufficient amount to pay current death losses and expenses and to provide for the day when the death rate would increase. As much as ten years ago this mistake was apparent, and it struck the order broadside some two years ago. . . . Desperate strides have, for the past five years, been made to keep the increase larger than the lapses. In 1898 the order wrote \$23,178,000 and lapsed \$43,725,000. In 1899 an extraordinary effort placed the new business at \$27,187,000, while \$25,048,500 lapsed. This hard work was continued throughout 1900 and at the close of that year it is shown that \$29,708,500 was written and \$20,804,000 lapsed. It is known that high pressure methods have been used under the "special dispensation" plan to swell the membership, and in this way the increase of insurance in force came also, but if the risks are not extraordinarily good, this "drag-net" process will militate against the order rather than in its favor. The expenses for 1900 exceeded those of the previous year over \$7,000, while the unpaid claims at the end of 1900 exceeded those of the previous year \$21,173.80, reaching the amount of \$754,923.80.

The total income of this order, with an addition of 12,913 members in 1899, was \$6,693,857.66, while in 1900, with 24,086 new members, the total income was \$6,826,982.66, an increase over the previous year of \$133,125, but in unpaid claims and increased expenses the order

fell back \$28,173.80 over the previous year. It occurs to us that with an increase of 11,173 new members in 1900 over that of 1899, the result should have been different. The following is a summary of the statement of the order for business done during 1900, as shown by the Connecticut report:

Total income,	-	-	\$6,826,982.66
Assets and income,	-	-	8,400,019.42
Total paid members,	-	-	6,277,075.15
Total expense,	-	-	162,073.84
New business,	-	-	29,708,500.00
Lapse and decrease,	-	-	20,804,000.00
Unpaid claims first of year,	-	-	733,750.00
Unpaid claims end of year,	-	-	754,923.80
Increase in unpaid claims over previous year,	-	-	21,173.80

If there are Catholics desirous of joining the Royal Arcanum, who can not be deterred by the argument that it is a suspect society religiously they will perhaps be impressed by the lesson conveyed in the above figures. That is why we reproduce them.—d'AZINCOURT.



EDITORIAL LETTER-BOX.

L. M. R.—If you had attended the séance and reported the true facts, I might have been enabled to take the matter up. . . . *Ph. M.*—The average price of mass wine in the U. S. is about 75 cts. There is a duty on all wines imported from Canada of \$1.60 per case of 12 bottles containing less than 1 quart each, or 40 cts. per gallon if in casks. . . . *R. S.*—Pamphlets received. They would be excellent material for the Truth Society to spread. At any rate, an English translation ought to be made of them, as also of P. Nilkes,' S. J., 'Schutz- und Trutzwaffen im Kampfe gegen den modernen Unglauben'. . . . *J. T. Comes.*—Joseph Conradi, Burlington Bdg.; W. Kloe, 916 Allen Ave.; E. Frei, Temple Bdg. . . . *J. G. S.*—There is so much of this "psychic" rot circulated now-a-days that I can not possibly undertake to collect it in a heap; moreover, it would only call attention to stuff of which any sane person will at once recognize the true character, while the ignorant, for whom this literature is intended, don't read *THE REVIEW* and would therefore not be benefited.

Literary Notes.

—The second edition of the *Kirchenlexikon* (B. Herder) is now complete. It comprises twelve solid volumes and has contributions from six hundred leading Catholic savants. Dr. Kaulen has devoted a large part of his time since 1880 to the publication of this incomparable work, the editorship of which he assumed after Dr. Hergenröther had been elevated to the purple. 946 articles are from his pen. Compared with the first, this second edition of the *Kirchenlexikon* is practically a new work. The few papers that have been taken over (among others four by Dr. Döllinger) have mostly been overhauled. There was talk at one time of an English edition of this great cyclopedia. It would be a blessing for the English speaking Catholic world. How about it?—A. P.

—Much ado has lately made about "A Search for an Infidel," a book by "Rev." Jenkin Lloyd Jones, a Chicago preacher, who some months ago made a stir by saying publicly that Protestantism is dead and that he himself purposed to found "the Catholic Church of the future." We have not seen the book, but the editor of the *Ave Maria*, who evidently has, says (No. 3) that it is "a volume of pleasant and frothy essays sicklied over with a pale cast of ethics," which "will not appeal to a wide public. 'Bits of Wayside Gospel' is its sub-title; but a benevolent naturalism is all that it inculcates, and even that is not done in a striking way. It is broad without depth, and it lacks ruggedness and masculinity."



A LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

[This list is published with the purpose of announcing important new publications of special interest to Catholic readers. B. Herder, 17 S. Broadway, St. Louis, Mo., supplies the list and has the books in stock.]

Life of the Ven. Madeleine Louise Sophie Barat. With an Introduction by the Rev. Reginald Colley, S. J. Net, \$3.

Stonyhurst. Its past history and life in the present. By Revs. Geo. Gruggen, S. J., and Jos. Keating, S. J. Net, \$2.

Spiritual Letters of the Ven. Francis Mary Paul Libermann; First Superior-General of the Congr. of the Holy Ghost. Vol. I. \$2.

Beyond these Voices. A Novel by Mrs. Edgerton. Net, \$1.35.

The Oratory of the Faithful Soul. By Lewis Blossius, of the Order of St. Benedict. Translated by the late Rt. Rev. Robert A. Coffin, C. SS. R. Boards. Net 20 cts.

SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY.

Historic Character of the Deluge. The historic character of the Deluge has long been attacked and denied, but modern science is coming back to a forced recognition of it.

In *McClure's* for June, and in the *Sunday School Times* of July 6th; Prof. Frederick G. Wright, of Oberlin, has published articles the drift of which is that geological science supports the Biblical account of the Deluge. He shows that man lived on the earth before the glacial catastrophes which followed the Tertiary Period, for his bones and his paleolithic implements are found in glacial deposits of loess and gravel, in Europe, Asia, and America. He shows that there were tremendous depressions of the earth's surface; for great beds of stratified sand and gravel, deposited by water, are found on the sides of mountains in Asia and about Ararat, several thousand feet above the present level of the ocean. This was not, he says, so many thousand years ago. Accordingly, he says:

The tendency of recent geological discoveries and discussions has been to render the story of the Flood more easily credible than it appeared to be twenty-five years ago.

Prof. Wright says the dimensions of the Ark are much the same, for length, breadth, and height, as in a modern first-class steamship, and "these proportions could not have been fixed upon by guesswork." The Genesis story, he says, "reads like the log-book of a sea-captain."



|| Housekeepers and pure food commissioners have a new foe to fight. It is viscogen as a milk adulterant. It has been found by inspectors of the Dairy Department in Minnesota, and, so far as known, its use is yet confined to that State. When its properties become generally known, however, it may confidently be looked for elsewhere. It is a syrup composed of sugar, lime, and water, about the color of water, and is used chiefly to make the milk appear richer than it really is. When viscogen is placed in milk or cream the lactic

acid turns the lime in the fluid into a white, thick substance, which, assimilating with the milk, gives it an appearance and taste of great richness. It is possible through its use to palm off upon customers milk and cream which is far below standard. Fortunately, the adulterant, according to Minnesota authorities, is not injurious to health.

|| Washington contracts with a company to collect and reduce its garbage, and the process is a revelation to those who regard garbage as a mere waste. The garbage is collected separately from ashes and other refuse, and placed in wheeled iron tanks. The tanks are taken by railway trains to the reduction works, thirty miles down the Potomac. After the garbage is sorted, and cans, bottles, and other foreign substances removed, it is placed in digesters and subject to steam pressure. Next it is pumped into great tanks and allowed to settle. The oil rises to the top, and is removed and sold to soap manufactories. Then the residue is placed under enormous hydraulic pressure and more oil is obtained. The pressed garbage is pulverized, and all metal and glass removed, after which it is stored for sale as a fertilizer. It is odorless, and looks like a gray dirt. The dead animals of Washington are sent to the same works. Horse-hides are converted into russet leather. The carcasses go into digesters, the oil is extracted, and the residue made into fertilizer. The sale of the by-products makes a very tidy figure each month, and yet the Washington process is decidedly inferior, from an economic point of view, to many that are in operation in Europe.

Swiss cheese is now made in this country as good as anywhere. We always had the holes, but the art of getting the cheese around them took long to learn.

"Solutio omnium difficultatum Christus." This profound saying of one of the Fathers of the Church is true to-day as it was at the time when it was uttered: It is Christ alone who can solve our problems.—Louis Veuillot, *Life*, ii, p. 275.

ART NOTES.

The American Ecclesiological Society.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE REVIEW.—*Sir:*

Through the courtesy of Mr. Joseph Otten, I have your name and also that you are interested in the subject of Ecclesiology and Church Music. I enclose a circular we issued a short time ago on the formation of a society which will have for its object the promotion of these arts. Undoubtedly you are familiar with the good work the Deutsche Gesellschaft für christliche Kunst is doing in Germany. It is the intention of the promoters of the American Ecclesiological Society to organise on similar lines and we hope to be similarly successful. A constitution is now in progress of development, and if you wish, I will forward you a copy later, for suggestion and a statement of the conditions of your city as bearing on such a society; as the conditions in the large cities throughout the Union should be taken into consideration in framing a constitution for a society which will be national and indigenous to the various centers of diffusion.

JOHN T. COMES.

Pittsburg, Pa.

* * *

We have already briefly referred to the American Ecclesiological Society. Its object is, according to the circular enclosed by Mr. Comes, to stimulate the cause of Catholic art in America; to increase among our people the knowledge of ecclesiastical art; to encourage all creative art that is imbued with an obedient Christian spirit; to counteract the anti-Christian spirit engendered by commercial greed; to strengthen the coöperation between Catholic architects, artists, and all those who are interested in the study, practice, and promotion of art of every form, but more particularly church architecture, decorations, and instrumenta ecclesiastica; and to raise the standard of excellence which is now deplorably inadequate.

The Society, in order to carry out these several aims, proposes to employ a number of means, such as exhibitions, lectures, meeting

for discussions, monographs and other publications.

The signers of the call to the first meeting were:

Chas. D. Maginnis, Colonial Bldg., Boston, Mass.; John T. Comes, Liberty National Bank Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Rev. Jno. B. McGrath, City Island, New York; Dr. F. L. Flick, 736 Pine Street, Philadelphia; Nicola D'Ascenzo, 1020 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia; J. P. Hynes, Toronto, Ca.

EDUCATIONAL TOPICS.

The O'Brien Plan. President O'Brien of the N. Y. Board of Education proposes that the Board buy so far as possible all the private schools of the city, and retain in the city's service all teachers who pass a qualifying examination "without sectarian bias."

This plan is undoubtedly well meant. Whether it is worthy of Catholic approval is a question which we may well leave unanswered, since the scheme has not the ghost of a chance of ever being carried out.

The *Evening Post*, one of the justest and most conservative secular newspapers of the metropolis, comments on it as follows (Aug. 6th):

We have no wish to question President O'Brien's perfect good faith in the matter. It may well appear to him that a condition of things in which thousands of children lack school privileges and thousands more are in part-time classes, calls for so radical a remedy. The plan, however, carries with it grave embarrassments, which the Board of Education will duly consider. It may well be doubted if sectarian schools, continued under their original staff, could have the non-sectarian character which, in our public schools, is absolutely necessary. We feel confident that the Board will prefer to attack the problem of supplying adequate school facilities directly, by the building of more school-houses and the organising of more schools. Any plan of wholesale purchase would certainly have to overcome grave doubts in the minds of our best citizens before it could be seriously considered—much less adopted.

Catholic Federation.

A New Conference. This notice has come to us, and we give it publicity for the good of the cause :

"A meeting for the purpose of considering plans and constitution for National Federation of Catholic Societies will be held in the Lyceum Building at Long Branch, New Jersey, on Wednesday, August 28th, 1901, 8 p. m. Hotel accommodations have been arranged at \$1.50 per day, including room and board.

Right Rev. James A. McFaul, Bishop of Trenton, and other prominent clergy and laity interested in the success of the movement will be present.

All Catholic societies should send at least two delegates to this meeting and report previously their name and time of arrival to the undersigned so that proper arrangements may be made for their accommodation. Address: Thomas P. McKenna, Secretary, Long Branch, N. J."



The German Plan.

Addressing the late convention of German Catholic societies at Buffalo, N. Y., Bishop Quigley of that diocese declared :

"I am fully conversant with your program and your aims, to bring all German Catholic men together, to present a united front for the protection of your rights as Catholics and as citizens. I am sure you have the unqualified sympathy and support of the entire clergy, and I express hereby my heartiest approval of your work. Continue energetically in the path you have chosen, and the Catholic men of other nationalities will follow your example, not alone in this State, but in all other States of the Union.

"We should have in every congregation an organisation after your plan. Clergy and laymen should come together to further the interests of the Church, and we would soon be a power to command respect in public life. These conventions should take place every

year and every German Catholic society should join. The time has come for united action; may God shower upon your proceedings His richest blessings."

NOTES AND REMARKS.

Rev. Dr. Charles Maignen calls our attention in to a slight error in our translation of his recent paper on Americanism, which he had written for us in French. On page 242, column 2, line 18, the words attributed to the Abbé Klein: "It is a reminiscence of Emile Zola, etc." are not by Rev. Klein, but Dr. Maignen's. The "he said" and the inverted commas should have been omitted.



We would call the attention of our Americanissimi to a revival of Cahenslyism on the part of an Italian Bishop, Msgr. Scalabrini, of Piacenza, who has come to this country in the interests of the St. Raphael's Society, of which Peter Paul Cahensly is General Secretary, with a view to see what can be done for the Italian emigrants who have settled here and are so largely drifting away from the Church. It is astounding to see such a sterling American paper like the *Catholic Citizen* welcome this emissary of a foreign society of such evil repute. [What about the Catholic Monroe doctrine it asserted against Mr. Cahensly? And are not our American bishops doing their full duty towards the Catholics of all nationalities? If their journalistic champions remain silent, we trust the protesting voice of the great and vigilant Archbishop of St. Paul will make the welkin ring against this Italian Cahensly in canonicals!!!—A. P.



Under the caption "L'intervention du Pape dans l'élection de son successeur," our friend M. l'Abbé G. Périès, formerly Professor of Canon Law in the Catholic University of America, is publishing, in the *Ami du Clergé*, a profound and highly interesting disquisition on the question, recently much mooted, whether the Pope can appoint his own succes-

sor. In his introduction he says that it was not originally his intention to treat this difficult question, but some private utterances of his having gotten into the newspapers, he thought it best to explain and prove his thesis. What this thesis is, we are as yet unable to make out. We think it is, that the Pope can not name his successor. We shall endeavor to present a synopsis of the Doctor's paper to our readers as soon as it is finished.—A. P.



An inquiry as to whether members of the Order could join the Modern Woodmen of America against the admonition of their pastor was presented by St. Benedict Court, No. 1172, of Clyde, Mo., and the H. S. was instructed to reply that as far as the High Court was concerned the Modern Woodmen of America did not belong to the prohibited societies, and that therefore members of the Catholic Order of Foresters could not be prevented from joining that organisation.—*The Catholic Forester*, July 1st.

A truly Delphic oracle. The High Court of the Catholic Foresters, like a Pythia of the age, declares that, as far as the High Court is concerned, the Modern Woodmen do not belong to the forbidden societies and that therefore members of the Catholic Order of Foresters can not be prevented from joining that organisation. As a shaky insurance concern the Catholic Order of Foresters does well not to excommunicate the Modern Woodmen. But if the Catholic Order of Foresters aims at fostering Catholic life, it ought to know that a Catholic is bound to avoid not only societies forbidden by name, but also those which are on general principles recognized as dangerous to faith and morals. Such are the Modern Woodmen.

The High Court of the Catholic Foresters acted about as foolishly as the man who, asked about the poisonous nature of cyankali, answered, he had a list of poisons, but cyankali was not among them, hence it was harmless.—J. F. M.



The New York *Herald* still prints cable letters from M. Cornély, who was lately expelled from the *Figaro* office. These letters,

which bristle with anti-Catholic falsehoods, are reproduced by several other daily American newspapers. In view of this fact the *Messenger of the Sacred Heart* (No. 8) does well to point out that M. Paul de Cassagnac, in his paper, *L'Autorité*, describes Cornély's communications as "gratuitous calumnies," and referring to this correspondent's notorious change of principles, calls him "a double Judas, who would treble his treason and quadruple his apostasy if, perchance, there were anyone else to betray and anything else to deny."



There is no reason why our Catholic mutual insurance societies should not, even at safe rates, furnish cheaper insurance than the old-line concerns, because they can operate with much less expense.

But do they? Here are the Catholic Knights of America, charged with extravagance in their own official organ (vol. iv, No. 23), whose editor declares that he is in receipt of a large number of letters voicing the dissatisfaction of members with the management. The salary of the supreme officers has been increased \$2,000 per annum, the office expense allowance \$200, and the contract for getting out the *Journal* has been awarded to a man whose bid was \$1,200 higher than that of the lowest bidder.

With the O'Brien embezzlement of a few years ago still vividly in mind, can the rank and file of the members, when they read such things in the official organ, be blamed for losing confidence?—A. P.



Rev. Dr. A. A. Lambing is an excellent authority for this plain, emphatic statement (*Pittsburg Catholic* July 17th): "Interest on church debts has done more in the last half century to make banks flourish than it has done to make religion flourish."



The Church may lose soldiers, but she can never lose battles.—Dupanloup (quoted in the *Life of Louis Veuillot*, ii, 48.)

CURIOUS FACTS AND FANCIES.

A collaborator of the *N. Y. Sun* has devoted much leisure time to a study of the Catholic Directory. Some of his discoveries are interesting enough to be briefly mentioned in *THE REVIEW*.

While there is neither a Mac nor an O among the archbishops of the U. S., the proportion of the Mc's to the O's has become even 6 to 6 by the appointment of Msgr. O'Connell to the see of Portland and Fr. O'Connor to the see of Newark. 6 to 5 seems to be nearly the proportion they hold among the 11,987 members of the priesthood, parochial and regular, there being 638 Mc's to 517 O's.

The Mc's among the bishops are McCloskey, Louisville; McDonnell, Brooklyn; McFaul, Trenton; McGavick, Chicago; McGolrick, Duluth, and McQuaid, Rochester. The O's are O'Dea, Vancouver; O'Donahue, Indianapolis; O'Gorman, Sioux Falls; O'Reilly, Peoria; O'Connell, Portland, and O'Connor, Newark.

Among the archbishops there are two French representatives, Chapelle and Bourgade; one German, Katzer; four native Irish, Ryan, Feehan, Keane, and Ireland; three Irish-Americans, Corrigan, Williams, and Kain; and one pure United States, Elder. Archbishop Riordan of San Francisco was born in New Brunswick of Irish parents, and Archbishop Christie of Portland, Ore., is also a British-American of Scotch ancestry.

Among the eighty-two bishops, forty-nine are of Irish or Irish-American extraction, thirteen are German, eight are French, two are Belgian, and Bishop Michaud of Burlington, Vt., has a table all to himself. His father was a French-Canadian and his mother was an Irish woman.

The analysis of the long lists in the Directory shows some curious statistics as to individual names. The Smiths are the champion sacerdotal family, there being 112 of them in the various spellings of the name, viz., Smith, 47; Smyth, 16; Schmid, 6; Schmidt, 20; Schmit, 12; Schmitz, 11. Next

to them come 83 Murphys, and the third place goes to 82 Reillys—63 with the O and 19 without it.

Then follow 47 Walshes, 72 Kellys, 68 Ryans, 67 O'Briens, 57 Sullivans, 56 O'Connors, 45 Fitzgeralds, 44 Quinns, 44 O'Neills, 42 Bradys, 38 Lynches, 38 McCarthys, 37 Kennedys, and 34 Burkes.

We must leave the responsibility for the accuracy of these figures to the *Sun*.



THE REVIEW is in receipt of a letter from Mr. Paul L. Martin, Secretary of the Catholic Census Bureau, 517 New York Life Building, Omaha, Neb., which reads in part as follows:

"We have nearly completed the Catholic census of Omaha and South Omaha and through a comparison with the records of the sixteen local pastors have ascertained the names of the representative families,—i. e., those who are in good standing and would be apt to prove desirable subscribers to Catholic publications. Such a list has never been compiled here before and in view of the fact that we have no English Catholic paper in this vicinity, should be valuable to Catholic publishers elsewhere. The list is complete and up to date, giving the names and addresses of the faithful in Omaha and South Omaha and will be mailed to you upon receipt of ten dollars."

That is a novel and original way of covering the expense of a Catholic census.



Mr. Carl Blind, in an article in the July number of the *Nineteenth Century*, sets out to prove that the "Marseillaise" is of German origin. The melody, he declares, was originally that of the "Credo" of a Mass composed by Holtzmann, Kapellmeister to the Elector of the Palatinate, in 1776, and was subsequently borrowed by a French maître de chapelle. Mr. Blind does not explain how the melody came into the possession of Rouget de Lisle. But the idea of the air of the "Marseillaise" being "made in Germany," will be a surprise by no means agreeable to many Frenchmen.

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY



3 8151 001 32408 3

LIBRARY

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY

BRIGHTON, MASS.

